

### **RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Applicant through the attorney on the record and identified below thank the Examiner Ronald Baum for the courtesy of a telephone interview on January 25, 2007.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), the following is submitted as a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action. The following statement is intended to comply with the requirements of MPEP § 713.04 and expressly sets forth: (A) a brief description of the nature any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted; (B) identification of the claims discussed; (C) identification of specific prior art discussed; (D) identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed; (E) the general thrust of the principal arguments; (F) a general indication of any other pertinent matters; and (G) the general results or outcome of the interview, if appropriate.

On January 24, 2007, the undersigned contacted the examiner to discuss the Office Action of October 2, 2006, and the reasons that the rejection was maintained in view of the prior amendment. For the same reasons as discussed in a related case (application no. 10/000,396, now allowed), the examiner indicated that the use of the term "flow" in the claims was considered too broad in view of the prior art and that further limitation was required. (A) no exhibits were shown or discussed; (B) the independent claims were discussed generally but not specifically, mainly relating to a proposal to amend the claims to recite client/server (C/S) flow aspects and how the claims as thus amended would differ from the primary applied reference, the *Shipley* patent (6,119,236); (C) the *Shipley* patent (6,119,236) was discussed but only in general; (D) no proposed amendments were officially presented or discussed, but the claim amendments presented in this paper are consistent with the discussion; (E) the general thrust of the discussion was as set forth below in the next paragraphs; (F) no other matters were discussed; and (G) the undersigned stated that an amendment reflecting the points discussed would be shortly filed.

No agreement on particular claim language was reached, pending submission of a formal amendment.

The amendments herein and comments that follow are intended to be consistent with the discussion during the interview.

In the event that the foregoing record is not considered complete and accurate, the Examiner is respectfully requested to bring any incompleteness or inaccuracy to the attention of the undersigned.